

**REMARKS**

**Overview of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15-20, and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,851,107) in view of Weinberg et al. (US Patent 5,974,572) in further view of Banning et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,567) and in further view of Rivlin (U.S. Patent 6,032,159).

Claims 3-7, 21, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al. in view of Weinberg, in view of Banning, and further in view of Rivlin, and further in view of Washburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,157,779).

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al. in view of Weinberg, in further view of Banning, in further view of Rivlin, and in further view of Peddada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,533).

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al. in view of Weinberg, in further view of Banning, in further view of Rivlin, and in further view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,156).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al. in view of Weinberg, in further view of Banning, in further view of Rivlin, in further view of Gupta, and in further view of O'Donnell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,203).

**Status of the Claims/Amendments**

Claims 1-9 and 12-28 are pending. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 7, 15, and 22 have been amended.

**Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 1 includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record:

A computerized system for software development comprising:

    a source code editor operable to edit a source code module;

    a graphical design surface operable to display a graphical object representing actual code of the source code module and provide integrated testing of the source code module, wherein the integrated testing includes load testing;

a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module; and

an application datastore operative to store a previous version of the source code module,

wherein upon a change in the source code module, the change in the source code is immediately communicated to the graphical design surface and the graphical design surface is updated to reflect the change in the source code module, wherein the design surface displays the graphical object, the graphical object represents a database object, the design surface is operative to bind a particular database system to the database object, the database object further includes a database column, the source code module includes a variable, and the design surface is operative to bind the database column to the variable.

None of the cited art teaches or suggest the features of **a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module, and an application datastore operative to store a previous version of the source code module**. These features were originally found in now cancelled claim 3. In the rejection to that claim, the Examiner stated that this feature was taught by Washburn at column 2, lines 5-8 (Office Action dated 11/01/2005, page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Washburn describes a compare module that is adapted to compare saved test data with master data to determine if a new test was successful.

First, the cited portion of Washburn does not describe **a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module**. Washburn teaches managing test data indicative of the pass or fail status of a test done to a piece of software. This testing data is not versioning data, but rather statistics related to the success of a particular test.

Second, the cited portion of Washburn does not teach **an application datastore operative to store a previous version of the source code module**. The only data collected and stored by Washburn is the success of a test, and data representative of user actions made during the test. None of this is previous version of a source code module, and is instead related to the testing of software.

Because none of the cited art describes **a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module, and an application datastore operative to store a**

**previous version of the source code module**, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-9 and 12-14 are all variously dependent on independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 2, 4-9 and 12-14.

Claims 15 and 22, as amended, include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely, as represented by claim 15:

A computerized method for developing a software project, the method comprising:

creating a graphical object on a design surface, the graphical object representing actual code of a software module;

binding the graphical object to an application type;

generating source code particular to the application type;

maintaining versioning data of the software module;

and

storing a previous version of the software module,

wherein the design surface displays the graphical object, the graphical object represents a database object, the design surface is operative to bind a particular database system to the database object, the database object further includes a database column, the source code module includes a variable, and the design surface is operative to bind the database column to the variable, wherein the design surface further provides support for integrated testing of the software module, further wherein the integrated testing includes load testing.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests **maintaining versioning data of the software module and storing a previous version of the software module**, as added by amendment to claim 15. It is therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 15.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0556/140707.1  
**Application No.:** 09/717,680  
**Office Action Dated:** November 28, 2006

**PATENT**

Claim 22 includes similar features as claim 15, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 15. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 22.

Claims 16-21, and 23-28 are all variously dependent on independent claims 15, and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for the independent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 16-21, and 23-28.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Date: February 28, 2007

/Michael W. Tieff/  
Michael W. Tieff  
Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439